

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 59, 61-66, 68-73 and 75-79 are pending in the application, with claims 59, 66, and 73 being the independent claims. Claims 59, 64-66, 71-73, 78, and 79 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Objection to the Claims***

The Examiner has objected to claims 59, 61-66, 68-73, and 75-79 as allegedly containing informalities. Applicants have amended the aforementioned claims in order to clarify the subject matter therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 59, 61-66, 68-73, and 75-79 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

**Claims 59, 62, 64, 66, 69, 71, 73, 76, and 78**

The Examiner has rejected claims 59, 62, 64, 66, 69, 71, 73, 76, and 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,268 to Hughes et al. (“Hughes”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,960,399 to Barclay et al. (“Barclay”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 59 recites, *inter alia*, a communication module “operable to transmit a control signal to [a] local device for directing an action in a primary

functionality component of the local device.” The Examiner acknowledges that Hughes does not teach or suggest the transmission of a control signal to a local device, where the control signal is used to direct an action in the primary functionality component of the local device. (Office Action, p. 4).

Instead, the Examiner relies on Barclay as allegedly teaching the aforementioned features. However, Barclay does not teach or suggest a “primary functionality component” in a local device, as recited in claim 59. Barclay discloses the transmission of “keyword-value pairs attached as a header to the speech data sent,” which are used by the client itself to determine what action it should perform. (Barclay, col. 8, ll. 12-28). Applicants disagree that these keyword-value pairs function as a “control signal,” as recited in claim 59. Moreover, since the keyword-value pairs are for the use of the client itself in order to determine what action it should perform, there is no “primary functionality component,” as also recited in claim 59. For example, Barclay discloses that the client can receive keyword-value pairs and make a determination to display transcribed speech to a user or to fill in a form. (Barclay, col. 8, ll. 28-36). Additionally, a display device in Barclay would not be a “primary functionality component” as the keyword-value pairs would instruct the client, not the display device. In contrast, claim 59 recites the transmission of control signals “for directing an action in a primary functionality component.” The control signals are not instructions directed to the client as in Barclay. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, amended claim 59 is patentable over the combination of Hughes and Barclay. Moreover, dependent claims 62 and 64 are also not rendered obvious by the combination of Hughes and Barclay for at least the same reasons as claim 59, from which they depend, and further in view of their own

respective features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 59, 62, and 64 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent claims 66 and 73 similarly recite, *inter alia*, “transmitting a control signal to the local device for directing an action in a primary functionality component of the local device,” and are also not rendered obvious by the combination of Hughes and Barclay for similar reasons as independent claim 59. Moreover, dependent claims 69 and 71, which depend from claim 66, and claims 76 and 78, which depend from claim 73, are also not rendered obvious by the combination of Hughes and Barclay for at least the same reasons as claims 66 and 73, and further in view of their own respective features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 66, 69, 71, 73, 76, and 78 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Claims 61, 63, 65, 68, 70, 72, 75, 77, and 79**

The Examiner has rejected claims 61, 63, 65, 68, 70, 72, 75, 77, and 79 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Hughes in view of Barclay, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,859 to Houser et al. (“Houser”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As noted above, the combination of Hughes and Barclay does not teach or suggest a “primary functionality component,” and therefore do not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 59, 66, and 73. Houser does not supply the missing teachings, and is not used by the Examiner in formulating a rejection regarding the aforementioned missing feature. Accordingly, claims 59, 66, and 73 are patentable over the combination of Hughes, Barclay, and Houser.

Claims 61, 63, and 65, which depend from claim 59, claims 68, 70, and 72, which depend from claim 66, and claims 75, 77, and 79, which depend from claim 73, are also not rendered obvious by the combination of Hughes, Barclay, and Houser for at least the same reasons as claims 59, 66, and 73, and further in view of their own respective features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 61, 63, 65, 68, 70, 72, 75, 77, and 79 is therefore respectfully requested.


***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward J. Kessler  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 25,688

Date: 4 June 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

*790332\_1.DOC*